THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE N.V. RAMANA

Writ Petition No. 21872 of 2007

Date: 12.10.2007

Between:

K. Anji Reddy.

..... PETITIONER

AND

The APSRTC, rep. by its Vice-Chairman and
Managing Director,
Musheerabad, Hyderabad and others.

.....RESPONDENTS

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE N.V. RAMANA

Writ Petition No. 21872 of 2007

Order:

By this writ petition, the petitioner seeks to direct respondent No.5-Labour Court-II, Hyderabad, to take up I.D. No. 94 of 2006, filed by him against the removal order dated 10.11.2005 passed by respondent No.2-Depot Manager, on out of turn basis, and dispose of the same at an early date.

According to the petitioner, against the show cause notice of removal issued by the respondent-Corporation, earlier he filed W.P. No. 22801 of 2005, and this Court, at the stage of admission on 24.10.2007, disposed of the said writ petition with a direction to raise all the grounds on questions of fact and law, in his explanation, and further directed the 2nd respondent to take the explanation into account before passing the final order. But, the 2nd respondent, without properly considering the explanation submitted by him, has passed the impugned removal order, and against the said removal order, he raised an industrial dispute in I.D. No. 94 of 2006, which is pending consideration before the respondent No.5-Labour Court-II, Hyderabad. The grievance of the petitioner is that since 15.03.2005 he is out of employment, and in spite of his request, the Labour Court is not taking up his I.D., and therefore, he filed the present writ petition seeking to direct the Labour Court to take up the I.D on out of turn basis and dispose of the same at an early date.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel for the respondent-Corporation.

Normally, this Court, in exercise of its jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, does not manage or fix the rosters of the Tribunals. It is for the Tribunals to fix the schedule of hearing of the cases pending before it by giving priority to old matters. If any direction, as sought by the petitioner is granted, it would not only amount to disturbing the schedule of cases already fixed by the Tribunals, for hearing, but would also amount to pushing down the cases already listed for hearing before it, which might have been filed much prior to the petitioner. If there is any urgency in the matter, it is always open to the petitioner to move the Labour Court, but certainly, no direction as prayed for by the petitioner in the writ petition can be granted.

The writ petition is devoid of merit and the same is accordingly dismissed. However, if there is any urgency in the matter, the petitioner is at liberty to move the Labour Court for early disposal of I.D. filed by him. No costs.

_____

N.V. RAMANA, J.

Date: 12.10.2007
Nsr